DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 447 HE 014 899

AUTHOR Blumenthal, Peggy
TITLE American Study Programs in China: An Interim Report Card.
INSTITUTION National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council, Washington, D.C. Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China.; National Association for Foreign Students Affairs, Washington, D.C. China Education Clearinghouse.
SPONS AGENCY International Communication Agency, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 81
NOTE 60p.
AVAILABLE FROM U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse, 1860 19th St., N.W., Washington, DC 20009.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Advising; Academic Freedom; Chinese; College Programs; College Second Language Programs; *Cultural Differences; Graduate Students; Higher Education; Housing; *International Educational Exchange; Interpersonal Relationship; Research Problems; *Research Projects; *Student Exchange Programs; *Study Abroad; Summer Programs; Travel; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *China; United States

ABSTRACT

American study programs in China were assessed, based on interviews with American undergraduate or graduate students studying or doing research at various China institutions during the 1980-81 academic year and with Chinese administrators from the institutions. Four channels exist through which American students can arrange placement in China: national competition, institution-to-institution links, individual application (either to a Chinese university or the Ministry of Education), and short-term study programs packaged in the United States. Somewhere between 70 and 100 formal exchange agreements to facilitate the sharing of academic resources have been concluded between U.S. and Chinese institutions. A list of American institutions reporting such agreements is appended. Data are presented on the distribution of American students at Chinese universities during the 1980-81 academic year (excluding short-term language programs). In all the arrangements (except for the summer language programs), the majority of those going to China are American graduate students who are either taking coursework or doing dissertation research. Several small groups of undergraduates participate during the academic year, mainly in language programs. A summary is presented on general curricula, language classes, research difficulties, and field research. In addition, the following concerns are addressed: socializing with Chinese, housing, travel, supervision of students, university administration, credit and grading, and summer language programs. Appended materials include: U.S.-Chinese Institutional agreements, summer language programs in China, and a bibliography on U.S-China educational exchange. (SW)

ED214447

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NAFSA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

American Study Programs in China:

An Interim Report Card

Peggy Blumenthal

HE 014 899

U.S.-CHINA EDUCATION CLEARINGHOUSE

A joint project of:

Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China

and

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

Published by the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, DC, December 1981

Copyright ©1981 by:

Committee on Scholarly Communication with the
People's Republic of China
National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20418

and

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs
1860 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20009

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China or the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Foreword and Acknowledgments

Educational exchanges between the United States and the People's Republic of China (PRC) have increased dramatically since the normalization of relations on January 1, 1979. Americans now have opportunities to study and conduct research in China, and a number of U.S. academic institutions and private organizations have developed collaborative programs with the Chinese government or individual PRC universities.

Because of differences in the educational systems of the United States and China and limited contact between educators from the two countries for 30 years, the resumption of academic exchanges has been accompanied by inevitable misunderstandings and differences of opinion and approach. In the rush to reopen communication and establish new relationships, both sides have entered into agreements and launched programs that are perhaps not as explicit as is necessary. Moreover, because administrators, officials and exchange participants from both countries do not want to jeopardize new programs and opportunities, there has been an understandable tendency to overlook, ignore or minimize problems and shortcomings. To say this is not to suggest that existing programs are of little value; on the contrary, both sides have already accrued substantial benefits. As with any new program, however, it is appropriate—necessary—to review developments during the first few years so that problems can be solved and positive features strengthened in the future.

Since one of the principal responsibilities of the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse is to strengthen exchanges with China by collecting and disseminating information helpful to American institutions and individuals, we are pleased to publish Peggy Blumenthal's assessment of American study programs in China. Though critical of certain features of these programs, Ms. Blumenthal is careful to note the constraints and exceptions shaping developments and to point out that there are no villains. Difficulties have been caused, aggravated—and at times alleviated—by well-intentioned people in both countries. Only by identifying and acknowledging problems can we hope to solve them.

Peggy Blumenthal is currently assistant director of Stanford Overseas Studies at Stanford University. Previously employed at the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations and at the Asia Society, she helped coordinate early cultural exchanges between the United States and the People's Republic of China. An active member of the Section of U.S. Students Abroad (SECUSSA) of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, she is currently a member of the SECUSSA National Team. Ms. Blumenthal collected the information for this report during March-June 1981 (her third visit to the PRC). Fifteen years earlier, she spent three months in Taiwan where she studied Chinese and taught English while an undergraduate.

Ms. Blumenthal prepared this report for the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse, a joint project of the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China (CSCPRC) and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA). Formed in October 1979, the Clearinghouse is supported financially by the U.S. International Communication Agency and will continue as a joint project until December 31, 1981. Thereafter each of the parent organizations

will continue to perform functions of the Clearinghouse relevant to its role in international education. (The CSCPRC is jointly sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Academy of Sciences and the Social Science Research Council.)

The information presented in this report was gathered from interviews with Americans studying or doing research at various institutions in China during the 1980–81 academic year and with Chinese administrators from those institutions. It is hoped that these materials will help U.S. institutions assess their study programs in China and encourage them to make any changes that seem warranted.

We wish to acknowledge and thank the following persons for their thoughtful review of this manuscript:

Archer Brown, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

Mary Brown Bullock, Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China

Jean Delaney, University of Colorado, Boulder

Robert Geyer, Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China

James Haas, Indiana University

John Jamieson, University of California, Berkeley

John Johnson, University of Kentucky, Lexington

Michel Oksenberg, University of Michigan

Leslie Palmer, University of Maryland, College Park

Georgia Stewart, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

Carl Walter, Stanford University

We also wish to thank Anna Corrales of the NAFSA staff and Wade French of Stanford University for their efficient and accurate assistance in preparing this manuscript.

The views contained in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of the CSCPRC or its sponsoring organizations, of NAFSA or of the U.S. International Communication Agency.

Any comments or questions about this publication or about Clearinghouse projects should be directed to:

Dr. Thomas Fingar
Committee on Scholarly Communication
with the People's Republic of China
2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20418
202/334-2718

Ms. Linda A. Reed
National Association for
Foreign Student Affairs
1860 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20009
202/462-4811

Additional copies of this publication can be obtained from the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse, 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009.

Thomas Fingar, CSCPRC
Linda A. Reed, NAFSA
U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse

Washington, DC
October 1981

Note from the Author

The views expressed here, while my own, grow out of extended conversations with American and Chinese friends and acquaintances, all of whom were remarkably willing to share their experiences and opinions. The U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse provided crucial support, both for my own work and for the national dissemination of information about the academic exchange process. I must also thank Stanford Overseas Studies for allowing me the leave-time to pursue this research; my husband, Doug Murray, created the opportunity, shared the process and helped shape the product. The complexity of the issues and the rapidity with which Chinese policies and institutions are changing inevitably lead to errors of fact and interpretation, for which I take sole responsibility. Some readers may be disturbed by the report's critical tone emphasizing strains more than successes. I believe that both sides appreciate and applaud the accomplishments of renewed academic exchanges; problems have been less widely discussed or understood. By calling attention to problems, this report is intended to help strengthen the exchange relationship.

Peggy Blumenthal
Stanford, CA
August 1981

Contents

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

DEFINING THE ISSUES 4
- Numbers of Students/Researchers/Faculty 4
- Attitudes of Participants 5
- Validity of Information 6
- Changing Context 7

THE RANGE OF ACTIVITY 9
- Avenues of Access 9
- Distribution of Students 10
- Program Models 11
- Profile of Students 12

ACADEMIC GOALS AND REALITIES 14
- General Curricula 14
- Language Classes 14
- Research Difficulties 16
- Field Research 18

DAILY LIVING 21
- Socializing with Chinese 21
- Housing 22
- Travel 23

SUPERVISION OF STUDENTS 26
- Role of the *Liuban* 26
- University Administration 27
- Faculty Advisers 28
- Home Campus Supervision 28
- Credit and Grading 29

SUMMER LANGUAGE PROGRAMS 31

EVALUATION AND SUMMARY 34

APPENDICES 39
- A. U.S.-Chinese Institutional Agreements 39
- B. Chinese Institutions with American Students on Campus for Six Months or Longer in 1980–81 44

C. Summer Language Programs in China for American Students 46
D. Sample Brochure Describing Short-term Language Programs Offered by a Chinese University 48
E. Selected Bibliography on U.S.-China Educational Exchanges 51

Introduction

American study programs in China, nonexistent three years ago, now proliferate. Virtually every U.S. institution with an East Asian studies program has developed a vehicle through which some of its faculty and/or students can pursue academic interests in the People's Republic of China (PRC). A number of smaller colleges and various nonacademic organizations sponsor short-term (less than three months) language training programs for students and others who wish to go to China under the study abroad rubric. The formats of these programs vary considerably, as do the types of students involved, but many common elements exist. A three month on-site investigation of American study programs in the PRC revealed that program participants, administrators and Chinese hosts share many concerns. The report which follows will outline these concerns, describe how various institutions have attempted to deal with them and discuss the probable future of American study programs in China.

Many of the questions raised by programs in China are identical to those confronting study abroad programs around the world:

1. Are the academic opportunities comparable to those on the home campus? If not comparable, are they sufficient to justify institutional sponsorship of the work done overseas?

2. How does the home institution interpret students' work done in China, and translate it into American academic terms? How are grades and credit awarded?

3. How does one quantify/assess the nonacademic learning which inevitably forms a major portion of the student's educational experience in China? Is it appropriate for the American institution to create such opportunities for its students despite the uncertain quality of the formal learning situation?

4. How do Chinese cultural/educational/governmental structures shape the student's experience? To the extent that they inhibit or limit that experience, how can they be transcended, ameliorated or, at a minimum, better understood?

5. What types/levels of students should participate in China study programs? What types of program structure are the most effective, given the local resources and constraints? How important or viable is continuing supervision by American faculty?

6. Are the program goals clearly defined on both sides? Beyond the creation of a new opportunity, what inherent value does the program offer to participating institutions and individuals? How is the program evaluated to assess the degree to which its goals have been met?

Study abroad administrators have wrestled for years with these same questions, but they take on sharper definition in China. Both the suddenness of program development there and the "foreignness" of the educational, cultural and political context in which they operate tend to exaggerate each issue and make its resolution

more problematic. It is too early in America's experience with China to expect definitive answers to the above questions, and indeed there may be none for China or anywhere else in the world. In the case of China, however, many U.S. institutions are moving so quickly, and with so little discussion of the above issues, that problems are being built into the exchange relationship which could imperil its future. That such problems exist, just two years after formal rapprochement between the two countries, is hardly surprising, but the denial (or unawareness) of these problems by so many of the participants argues for much wider public discussion of the questions raised in this report.

The potential rewards of sustained academic exchange are substantial, not just for China but also for the United States, and both sides already benefit from the developing relationship. Whatever the limitations, American scholars and students have enormously expanded access to Chinese materials and colleagues and no longer must decipher China from a distance (either geographic or psychological). The cumulative and interactive insights of American academics, business people, journalists and government officials have considerably sharpened the general U.S. view of China, heightening the detail and realism of American understanding. Personal links between Chinese and Americans in a wide range of fields permit not only greater short-term cooperation, but also the potential for future relationships which may endure through—and may even soften the effects of—possible shifts in governmental attitudes toward each other. As a developing country, China has pressing immediate needs which it hopes to alleviate through academic and other exchanges with the United States; but Americans should not underestimate the benefits to the United States as well, both through increased presence in China and through the contributions of Chinese scholars working within academic institutions in the United States.

This report ignores almost entirely one-half the exchange equation, namely, the receiving of Chinese students and scholars by U.S. institutions. That aspect of the relationship has been reviewed in various articles and reports listed in the bibliography of this publication. Similarly, little attention is given to the details of daily life for American students in China since such information is readily available in *China Bound,* Karen Gottschang's excellent handbook for students, researchers and teachers planning an extended stay in the PRC (for the full citation, see the Bibliography). While the problems of American faculty and researchers in China in some ways parallel those of students, and are occasionally noted in passing, this report focuses on the situation of American students (both undergraduate and graduate) studying in China under a variety of sponsors. Clearly, the experience of many senior American scholars has been substantially different from—and often more productive than—that described below.

The report is meant neither as an inventory or a blueprint; it is an open-ended discussion of how Americans and Chinese perceive the American study experience to date and what the future is likely to hold. It is aimed more at higher education officials and study abroad administrators than at program participants, although the lives of the latter are most directly affected by its findings. Certain sections of the report dwell more on difficulties created by the Chinese educational structure, others on weaknesses in the American approach to the exchange process. Read as a whole,

the report is intended to describe, not to assign blame for, the inevitable start-up problems of this new and exciting venture. The goal is to widen discussion of these issues among all those involved in the exchange process with China.

Defining the Issues

NUMBERS OF STUDENTS/RESEARCHERS/FACULTY

U.S. Department of State figures issued in mid-June 1981 indicated that approximately 600 Americans had studied or conducted research in China since February 1979. (This figures does not include the 300–400 participants in 1981 summer language programs). A recent study done for the International Communication Agency (see Bibliography) gives a slightly more modest cumulative estimate: approximately 300 American students and faculty in China as of November 1980; this estimate omits the 1980 summer language students included by the State Department. Chinese Ministry of Education (MOE) figures for the 1980–81 academic year confirm the general scope of the exchange picture: at least 150 American students and scholars in China through cooperative programs between Chinese and American institutions; 30 to 50 independent students placed through the MOE; and 50 students/scholars participating in the national exchange program administered by the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China (CSCPRC). This estimate produces a total of 230–250 for 1980–81 which represents most of the cumulative total; approximately half are students; the remainder are faculty members or researchers.

The divergence in the above figures is partly a matter of definition: does one count students and/or non-students coming for summer language study, Chinese-American students placed through family arrangements, faculty invited for combined research/lecture tours? The varying definitions make it difficult to obtain accurate statistics, especially since neither the Chinese nor U.S. government maintains centralized records of the totals or sub-totals. Whatever the figures, however, the past two years have clearly produced a broad range of new contacts between U.S. and Chinese academics and some expectation of expanding numbers in both directions.

Unquestionably, the relationship has developed unevenly, at least numerically. The State Department estimates that approximately 6,000 Chinese students and scholars came to the United States from 1979 to mid-1981, compared with the maximum of 600 American students and faculty in China during that period. But this disproportion is not unique to the U.S.-China relationship; the number of foreign students in the United States from every country in Asia substantially exceeds the number of Americans studying in those countries. According to the Institute of International Education's (IIE) *Open Doors* survey for 1979–80, 330 Americans were studying in Japan through American college or university sponsored programs. (The total number of American students in Japan, according to official Japanese sources, is slightly over 500.) About 100 Americans study each year in Taiwan and about the same number in Hong Kong. Yet IIE reports that 17,500 students from Taiwan, 12,200 from Japan and 9,000 from Hong Kong were studying in the United States during 1979–80, producing ratios far more "unfavorable" than that of China and the United States. The fundamental disparity in American student participation in China programs probably has less to do with current exchange relationships than

with limited American interest or preparation; the overall numerical balance is unlikely to change dramatically whatever the study conditions.

ATTITUDES OF PARTICIPANTS

For those Americans who do study in China, however, the experience has proven a complex and often disillusioning one. Despite goodwill on both sides, students feel they are confronted with seemingly immovable obstacles to serious academic interaction, blocks which they fear might undermine the entire benefit of American study in China. From late March through June 1981, I met with Chinese officials and American students at Beijing University, Beijing Languages Institute, Beijing Normal, Fudan, Nanjing, Nankai, Wuhan and Zhongshan Universities, and with personnel at the Chinese Ministry of Education and the U.S. Embassy and Consulates. The eight Chinese universities visited include virtually all those receiving significant numbers of American students during the 1980–81 academic year; the 30–40 students interviewed represent approximately one-third the total number in China during the spring semester. In late June, I also conferred briefly with American students arriving for summer language programs at several other Chinese universities (East China Normal, Guangxi Normal and Xiamen Universities) and discussed initial reactions to some of these programs with the students and their hosts.

Interviews and personal observation suggested that officials of Chinese institutions believed they were making enormous efforts to accommodate American students, that American expectations and needs often bore little relation to Chinese educational resources and that substantial friction existed between students and administrative personnel at many schools. As a study abroad administrator, I am familiar with the inevitable student tensions that exist in any foreign study setting; the malaise in China was more pervasive and comprehensive than any I had observed previously.

American students and scholars in China complain bitterly about the constraints (logistical and political) on scholarly research; students are frustrated by the quality of teaching in both language and other courses. They resent the restrictions imposed on their personal freedom and those limiting their interaction with Chinese society.

On the Chinese side, host institutions are struggling to adjust to American demands, knowing that they lack the facilities, leverage or authority to meet most of them. While the exchange relationship is vitally important on the national and university level, individual departments receiving American students may have much less incentive to cooperate since they frequently receive few benefits while incurring many costs. The Americans' expectations and requirements are substantially different from those of other foreign students in China (who go primarily for language training or standard Chinese coursework), and Chinese universities are ill-equipped to cope rapidly with new demands.

Several of the year long American study programs in China have had difficulty recruiting qualified candidates and most summer language programs have been undersubscribed. Study abroad administrators wonder whether the pool of eager and adequately prepared American exchange candidates may be drying up. American government officials worry increasingly that the entire exchange process may be in

jeopardy as academic institutions, legislators and other funding sources hear negative reports from returned participants. Chinese officials remain publicly optimistic but acknowledge privately that problems might only intensify as the relationship proceeds. As one member of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences put it, "the hard work lies ahead, now that the cream has been skimmed." In the first year or two, both sides sent the most qualified of their considerable backlog of potential candidates and each side devoted special attention to the process. Even though procedures for exchanges at various levels have become more routine, problems have been left unresolved, leading to frustration on both sides. In reviewing these problems, this report aims not to discourage the exchange process (which holds enormous potential benefit for both sides) but to focus attention on the issues that must be confronted by those considering future study programs in China.

VALIDITY OF INFORMATION

A major difficulty encountered in making this assessment is the scarcity of accurate information on what has transpired to date. As noted above, the statistical data are confused and vague, and most impressionistic reporting is heavily biased in one direction or another.

Recent articles in the *Washington Post* (July 31, 1981) and *New York Times* (August 16, 1981) outlined some of the difficulties confronting American students; these were the first detailed U.S. media coverage of academic exchange problems with China since the process began. The articles quote (mostly anonymously) a number of China scholars and exchange officials but their criticisms are substantially hedged and understated. Program administrators (on both the Chinese and American sides) seem so eager for these fledgling efforts to succeed that they tend to gloss over or ignore problems, although many will privately share their frustrations and concerns. This phenomenon may be common to all human ventures, but it is exacerbated by American needs to defend institutional commitments that were perhaps overly optimistic and by Chinese tendencies to talk about goals rather than current realities. Americans in China are frequently confounded by the Chinese rhetorical habit of describing the intended situation rather than the actual one; those interacting with Chinese for the first time often assume they are being misled, when they simply misunderstand the terms of discussion. When implementing academic exchanges, such confusion has often led to disappointment on both sides.

In interviews at a dozen Chinese universities, the prognosis was relentlessly optimistic, with explicit plans to expand American enrollments steadily. Only one official seriously discussed the intensely felt problems of most American students and researchers; most raised no questions more serious than limited dormitory facilities or debates about curfews. Discussions with American program administrators were more balanced, but few willingly acknowledged the lack of unanimity (or lack of awareness) in their own institution about the status or value of their exchange program. Most appeared to have no concrete plans for correcting current dissatisfaction and were relying heavily on continued enthusiasm, generosity and gradual learning on both sides to resolve problems.

Contradicting the generally positive views from officials on both sides is the per-

vasive, almost paranoid, disillusionment of most (not all) program participants. Conversations with about one-third of the 100 plus American students in China in the spring of 1981 evoked almost unanimous criticism of their *academic* experience there. Although virtually all quite obviously had learned a great deal about China (and about themselves) during their stay, they felt that Chinese officials at many levels had conspired against that learning process. By the time they left, most students were openly hostile to the Chinese system of education and to Chinese officialdom in general.

The more aggressive and inventive students accomplished perhaps half of what they had intended (and caused various problems for their host institutions in the process); others simply dropped out of the academic context early on and did their learning elsewhere. All complained that the U.S. side (and their home institutions) should be taking a tougher line to improve study conditions for American students in China, although few proposed realistic strategies to achieve their goals without jeopardizing the overall exchange relationship. Despite the consistent goodwill verbalized by their Chinese university hosts, a depressingly large number of the American students felt personally victimized. These students will certainly mellow as they review their experience in retrospect, but the strength of their emotional response cannot be lightly dismissed.

CHANGING CONTEXT

Two final factors which complicate analysis of the American study experience in China are (a) the speed with which university conditions in China are already changing and (b) continuing Chinese policy debates which produce conflicting goals both within China and in its relations with other countries. During the period of observation in China (March-June 1981), the impact of educational policy shifts was clearly apparent, as well as a tightening and loosening of attitudes toward foreigners which bewildered and frustrated individuals participating in or administering academic exchanges. The tension between modernization and ideological purity, though possibly lessened by recent Party adjustments at the top, might never be fully resolved. How to balance China's need for Western technology and expertise with the risks of economic dependence or political "contamination" remains an unsolved equation. The tension is felt particularly strongly in universities, which must play a crucial modernizing role but have barely recovered from the trauma of the Cultural Revolution. Closed down completely for several years, with faculty and students dispersed to the countryside, most universities have only recently restored to pre-1966 levels their faculty, student body and academic facilities. All China's institutions feel under great pressure to move quickly and decisively to recover from the "lost decade," but their direction is by no means clear, at least not to this foreign observer.

Graham Peck's metaphor from *Two Kinds of Time* still vividly captures the outsider's frustration in trying to make sense of China, i.e., sitting on the bank of a powerful river, facing downstream, one observes only what has flowed past, with no sense of what lies upstream. Just as the present becomes clear, it is washed away by the future. This report, drafted in July 1981 and based on observations made the previous spring, is already outdated. Each Chinese university already has another

summer's experience with foreign students; statements by U.S. government and academic officials might (or might not) have heightened Chinese awareness of American educational concerns; the July shifts in Communist Party leadership surely will have influenced educational policy and U.S.-China relations at a variety of levels. The most this report can do is to capture the mood and experience of the early participants, both Chinese and Americans, whose attitudes and behavior will heavily influence future foreign study opportunities in China, for better or worse.

The Range of Activity

AVENUES OF ACCESS

Four channels exist through which American students can arrange placement in China: national competition, institution-to-institution links, individual application (either to a Chinese university or the Ministry of Education) and short-term study programs packaged in the United States. The National Program for Advanced Study and Research in China, administered by the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China, annually selects approximately 50 candidates who are placed in Chinese institutions by the Chinese Ministry of Education and various academies and are supported by U.S. government funding. The first group of seven arrived in China in February 1979; another 55 were added later that year; 43 were sent in 1980–81 and 38 in 1981–82, bringing the three year total to 143*. About half those chosen are graduate students, drawn predominantly but not exclusively from U.S. universities with major East Asian studies programs (e.g., Harvard, Michigan, Princeton, Stanford, UC-Berkeley, Yale). The students are placed mainly at China's leading nontechnical universities (Beijing, Fudan, Nanjing, Nankai, Wuhan, Zhongshan) and a few specialized research institutes.

Somewhere between 70 and 100 formal exchange agreements to facilitate the sharing of academic resources have been concluded between U.S. and Chinese institutions. A list of American institutions reporting such agreements, compiled by the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse, is given in Appendix A. Chinese Ministry of Education officials report reviewing almost 100 such agreements, but many appear to be preliminary documents through which no concrete exchanges have been realized or even proposed. About 100 American students went to China in the 1980–81 academic year through these institution-to-institution links (excluding those participating in short-term summer language programs); a sizable number of American faculty members went under these arrangements as well, for short or long-term periods of research and/or teaching.

About 35–50 American students (many of Chinese descent) have been placed individually in Chinese universities through direct application to the Ministry of Education. However, this represents only a handful of those applying to study in China through this route; those approved usually have personal or family connections at the proposed university. The short-term language programs that sprang up in the summer of 1981 at numerous Chinese universities accommodated 300–400 American students in China, two to three times the number of Americans studying there during the 1980–81 academic year. Some of these summer programs are

*A total of 143 students and scholars has been placed in China through the National Program but 21 students were able to extend their stays by up to one additional year and ten postdoctoral researchers were able to extend by up to four months. Therefore, the 143 total understates the number of slots supported and placed by the National Program by 31.

organized through institution-to-institution links; others are packaged by U.S.-based organizations with the Chinese Ministry of Education making the student placements in China; a few are cooperative efforts involving groups of American institutions and a single host university in China. Because the summer programs raise quite separate issues, they are discussed in a later section of this report.

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS

The above numerical summary fails to communicate how few American students are based at any given Chinese campus during the academic year and the programmatic vacuum in which most feel they are operating. The largest number of Americans (30–50) is concentrated at the Beijing Languages Institute (BLI), a principal language evaluation and teaching center for foreign students planning to study at other Chinese institutions. Students take placement tests at BLI and attend language classes there until they are reassigned to their permanent study sites. BLI also offers year long Chinese language instruction for approximately 500 students from the United States, Europe, Japan and Third World countries, and trains roughly an equal number of Chinese in foreign languages. In the fall of 1980–81, BLI received 50 Americans for language evaluation and training; 20 of these students had transferred to other Chinese institutions by December 1980. The remaining 30 included 15 students placed through agreements with four American schools and 15 individually assigned to BLI by the Ministry of Education.

The following table summarizes the distribution of American students at Chinese universities during the 1980–81 academic year (excluding short-term language programs):

	Number of Students			
Chinese University	**Institution-to-Institution Links**	**National Program**	**MOE**	**Total**
Beijing University	17	7	8	32
Beijing Languages Institute	15	--	15	30
Beijing Normal University	15	--	--	15
Fudan University	10	2	5	17
Nanjing University	8	8	3	19
Nankai University	3	2	1	6
Wuhan University	--	2	--	2
Zhongshan University	5	--	2	7
TOTAL	73	21	34	128

The figures in the table were received from the foreign affairs office at each Chinese university and may differ slightly from the American figures since the Chinese sometimes counted only those students remaining at the time of the inter-

view. They were also occasionally unclear about the home institution affiliation of a student or whether placement had been made through the National Program, a formal exchange agreement or the MOE. This confusion is understandable given the variety of exchange relationships maintained by many Chinese universities. The totals listed account for almost all American students in China for year long study during 1980–81.

Beijing University has the largest number of institution-to-institution links (13 formal agreements and at least four informal ones) but no American institution has sent more than one or two students per year through such arrangements, most of which involve faculty rather than student exchange. The 15 students at Beijing Normal all came through the University of Massachusetts language program, a consortium open to a number of institutions in the New England area. Nanjing's totals do not include the six Pomona College undergraduates who spent three months there during the spring; students staying less than six months are classified as short-term and sometimes are included in the summer student totals. Zhongshan's five institution-to-institution students are all from UCLA, with which Zhongshan also has an extensive faculty exchange program. Two universities not visited (Shandong and Shanghai Jiaotong) had a number of formal exchange agreements but were not reported to have any American students placed through these arrangements during the 1980–81 academic year. The only other significant concentration of American students in China during the academic year was a group of 15–20 Goshen College undergraduates who combined three-four months of Chinese language study with English language teaching at Sichuan Teachers College. A number of other American and Chinese institutions were in the process of negotiating agreements, but students had not yet been placed in China.

PROGRAM MODELS

Institution-to-institution relationships conform to no single pattern. In some cases, an agreement involves direct exchange of funded student slots in a specific ratio (because the costs of maintaining a student in China and the United States are unequal, students are sometimes exchanged at the ratio of several Americans for each Chinese). In this arrangement, the American and Chinese hosts normally waive tuition and room/board fees, provide special introductory language courses and permit enrollment in courses from the general curriculum. If the American school cannot fill its available slots in China with qualified candidates from its own campus, it sometimes recruits or accepts outside applicants. During the first year of exchanges, most American programs in China sent fewer participants than anticipated or sent students whose linguistic preparation was less than the standard originally agreed upon with the Chinese host. In a few cases, an American faculty member accompanied the students.

Other institutional relationships involve an agreement of access rather than an exchange of free slots. The American students pay tuition and room/board fees to the Chinese institution and the Chinese pay for their students/scholars in the United States, although the latter are frequently exempted from tuition or receive financial aid from the American department to which they have been admitted. In these ex-

change arrangements, both sides usually assumed that the arriving students would have sufficient language ability to enroll directly in regular university courses, along with other foreign students. This assumption proved unwarranted in the case of many Americans in China, and several Chinese institutions arranged special language programs after the students arrived. A few American schools are developing links with several Chinese institutions, and/or with specific departments within a university, and are arranging individual placement of students or scholars linked to ongoing research or teaching projects in a particular subject. (Appendix B lists the Chinese universities which had enrolled American students for periods of six months or longer in 1980–81 and the kinds of agreements involved.)

A single U.S. institution may have several students at the same Chinese university through different arrangements (e.g., some through the National Program, some through its institution-to-institution link and some arranged personally by faculty members collaborating in a specific field). While the terms of each arrangement differ, the individual students usually expect and push for equal treatment, generating confusion and dissatisfaction on both sides. There is also a good deal of communication between students at different Chinese institutions, comparing their treatment and lobbying their host university for whatever appears the most favorable terms, regardless of the conditions originally negotiated with their home institution. Just as the Chinese applying to American institutions are baffled by the range of costs, conditions and limitations, Americans in China seem caught in a maze of shifting and uneven rules and realities. Regulations affecting foreign students are applied inconsistently and with wide discretion. Both sides have trouble accepting the diversity and discretionary authority of the other's academic institutions.

PROFILE OF STUDENTS

In all the arrangements outlined above (except for the summer language programs), the majority of those going to China are American graduate students who are either taking coursework or doing dissertation research. Several small groups of undergraduates participate during the academic year, mainly in language programs. From the Chinese perspective, American students at any level are classified as *jinxiusheng* (advanced student) since they are not formally enrolled as degree candidates in China at either the undergraduate *(benkesheng)* or graduate *(yanjiusheng)* level. American graduate students doing research above the M.A. level are sometimes given a higher status *(gaoji jinxiusheng* or senior advanced student), indicating broader privileges as well as higher fees to cover faculty advising and research costs. Such fees are sometimes waived in the case of reciprocal exchange agreements. These categories, which at first seemed of purely semantic interest, turned out to be a major source of discontent and confusion since they implied various restrictions and obligations not always appropriate or clear to the individual students involved.

Most Americans pursuing long-term study went with at least two years of Chinese (although some interviewed fell below that standard, even in programs with a two year minimum requirement); only BLI and the summer language programs are prepared to provide beginning language training. Most other foreign students at Chinese universities either came with sufficient language proficiency or had

graduated from BLI's language training program; only through specific links with Chinese institutions can U.S. schools place students directly in regular university courses without prior linguistic screening, apparently expecting the Chinese to provide supplementary language classes or tutoring when needed.

Unlike other foreign students in China, a large percentage of the Americans were there to do research rather than coursework. Those at the appropriate level (i.e., post-M.A.) were normally assigned a faculty adviser who was responsible for helping them to secure access to needed materials. The degree of assistance they received and the limitations on access were continuing sources of friction; these issues are discussed in detail in the section that follows.

Academic Goals and Realities

The recent Clearinghouse publication, *China Bound: A Handbook for American Students, Researchers and Teachers,* contains detailed and up-to-date information on the academic and social context in which foreign students function in China. Rather than repeating (or condensing) material from that publication, this section will simply summarize the impression of the more than 30 students interviewed and suggest how their attitudes affected program effectiveness.

GENERAL CURRICULA

A few Chinese universities offer separate courses taught in Chinese for foreign students in a variety of fields. With some exceptions, these courses were considered inappropriately elementary for American graduate students. Students with sufficient language ability enrolled directly in the general university courses, usually in history, philosophy or literature. Not all departments are open to foreigners; law, politics and sometimes economics are generally off-limits, much to the frustration of visiting social science students. No departments of anthropology or sociology existed in 1980–81, but these fields are being revived at several universities. (It was not always clear whether students knew in advance which departments were closed to them and, if not, why not.) The normal course load for students taking general university classes was four to five courses, totaling 20–24 hours per week; after the first few months, few students attended more than 16 hours and quite a few stopped attending altogether. Chinese professors normally give two to three hour lectures (with each course meeting only once or twice a week); few American students were comfortable with these extended presentations, which rarely included opportunity for student questions. Where textbooks existed, they generally were not considered useful or interesting by most American students, although there were exceptions to this broad (perhaps unfair) observation. History, archeology and literature courses rated higher than those in other fields; this generalization held true at a variety of universities.

LANGUAGE CLASSES

Long-term students concentrating on language study also were expected to carry 20–24 hours per week at institutions such as BLI or Beijing Normal, both of which had established a formal range of courses at several levels. Where a university did not previously have a language program for foreigners and was creating it *ad hoc* to meet the needs of a small number of American students, class hours were considerably fewer (sometimes only 10–12 hours per week). Inadequate materials and inexperienced faculty were inherent problems for some of these universities. Frequently, language instructors had had no training or experience in teaching Chinese to non-native speakers or had not worked with the newly issued texts. Even students attending established language programs, however, had trouble adjusting to materials and a teaching style that relies heavily on memorization and recitation

rather than on more familiar methods of language instruction (conversation, pattern sentences, drills, quizzes, language labs, etc.).

The diversity of language levels within a single classroom also proved to be a widespread problem. When an American institution sends a small number of students with very diverse language preparation, the Chinese must either provide individual tutoring or merge the students into a single class. Even where the numbers were sufficient to justify several levels of instruction, students at the intermediate level tended to range over a wide spectrum, some with considerable verbal facility but limited reading skills and others the reverse. Chinese language instruction in the United States does not always include use of the PRC's simplified characters or *pinyin* romanization, adding to initial student confusion in China. Certainly there were some teachers whose style and flexibility proved quite effective at overcoming many of the inherent problems, and the great majority of teachers did attempt to adjust their style and materials to the students' needs. One aspect of the Chinese teaching method that was generally praised by the Americans was the coaching *(fudao)* system—the willingness of teachers to meet privately with students and work intensively on individual problems. However, since any teacher's time is limited by the number of students, and tutors cannot be hired privately to supplement formal instruction, students needing substantial remedial help were severely handicapped.

The summer language programs were generally better received by the Americans, perhaps because the students' academic expectations may not have been as high as those of year long students. Also, the length of the programs was short enough to limit the tedium of inadequate courses and the excitement of being in China sustained students through six weeks of intensive study. (A later section discusses the summer programs in more detail.)

Any evaluation of the teaching competence of individual instructors of Chinese clearly must be done more formally by language professionals with pre and post-testing, classroom observation, etc. However, the fact remains that most students in year long programs believed they were not progressing in the classroom, although many showed significant language proficiency (which they attributed to extra-curricular practice rather than formal study). Working on their own, they felt they improved their reading vocabulary, oral skills and knowledge of Chinese literature. Their own assessment might not be accurate, but it certainly influenced their decision about whether or not to continue attending classes, and many decided to drop out completely before the end of the year.

Graduate students going to China to satisfy language proficiency requirements felt under particular pressure; many who had spent time previously in Taiwan viewed that option as clearly more effective. Students with less specific language goals, or with a more general desire to "get a feel for China," usually were better satisfied with the training received and felt their progress was sufficient to justify the time invested. Frequently, however, even they decided that studying in their room (or talking with Chinese friends) yielded as much benefit as attending classes, much to the despair of their instructors whose course enrollments often dropped precipitously in just a few months. Almost half the Americans in one small institution program left early and went to Taiwan to complete their language study.

When a visiting American professor accompanied the group, or went separately to meet with Chinese hosts and review the program, the Chinese expressed great willingness to restructure the language classes and indeed made major changes for the following year. Some teachers were also remarkably willing to accept students' suggestions directly; for most, however, accepting student criticism was an uncomfortable process (complicated by the students' inability to communicate well in Chinese and their instructors' inability to understand English).

Obviously this is an area which will improve over time as Chinese universities refine their language training programs and gain more experience with American students. But the present situation provides a classic example of conflicting expectation and mutual frustration. Most American program administrators sending students to China are aware of deficiencies in language instruction, but hope their students will benefit from the general environment—the broader learning one receives by living in the country while studying its language. Some American universities explicitly recognize this by restricting the number of units of credit they award for language study in China; others fudge the issue and award some language credits for general cultural learning. Whether the students are aware of the pedagogical limits beforehand is less clear; but even when they are so advised, few students "hear" such warnings before they experience the reality.

Most of the American graduate students in China had gone with a very specific purpose: to achieve rapid language progress, to do dissertation research or to take classwork in very specific fields. They often arrived to find the language training less than ideal, the research opportunities restricted and relevant coursework either unavailable in their Chinese university or closed to foreign students. When they realized how unrealistic their goals were, they tended to blame their Chinese hosts and to push for changes in the system. The undergraduates, whose goals were less precise, were more likely to push for limited adjustments in the classroom setting or simply to drop out of classes that were not working well for them. Program participants who were not enrolled students, but recent graduates or temporarily enrolled nonmatrics, frequently had less commitment to the program as a whole and perhaps less specific academic goals. Thus the Chinese faced a baffling mix of student motivations; they had expected (perhaps naively) a carefully screened group of Americans highly motivated to master Chinese and willing to work within the existing university structure. The reality was more complicated; some universities made efforts to restructure classes, but these efforts often came too late to solve the problem during the same academic year.

RESEARCH DIFFICULTIES

The problem of students trying to do archival and field research is even thornier. Despite the theoretical need for prior Chinese approval of research topics, many students arrived in China with topics on which the Chinese were unable or unwilling to assist—because the research required access to materials unavailable to foreigners, in a chaotic state or outside the jurisdiction of the host university. The (sometimes intentionally) vague research plans submitted by American students, combined with the narrow range of topics which Chinese universities feel comfortable accepting,

make such dilemmas all too common. National level PRC restrictions on field research and constraints on Chinese-foreigner interaction only exacerbated an already unhappy situation. Several students interviewed said that two years in China might (with diligent pushing) produce one year of research progress; many students left China knowing that materials directly relevant to their research would never be available to them. It is impossible to anticipate how much energy and time must be devoted to building the credibility and network of contacts necessary to secure access even to basic materials; the minimal availability of such research aids as photocopy machines also multiplies significantly the time and frustration involved.

Chinese university officials insisted that they had made extraordinary efforts to assist students doing research and that American students refused to recognize the very real difficulties faced by Chinese institutions trying to negotiate access to materials outside their own areas of jurisdiction. The rigidity of China's bureaucracy and the authority which each bureaucratic unit has over its own personnel and resources is sometimes hard for even the most experienced China hand to accept. One student told of a municipal library she had used for several months which suddenly proclaimed itself off-limits to foreigners; no amount of pressure by the university or the student succeeded in reopening its archives to her. The Ministry of Education itself might have no leverage over municipally controlled archives. One research institution, reported to be at odds with a given university's foreign affairs office, refused to discuss the question of foreign student access to its facilities until a university staff member "peddled down on his bike and asked us politely."

The problem of limited and poor facilities is a very real one. Certain archives are still in confusion from the physical disruptions of the Cultural Revolution and have yet to be uncrated or reshelved. At least one major university reportedly has a one year backlog in reshelving any circulating material. When American students volunteered to help reshelve or uncrate materials in hope of quicker access, their offers were refused (further evidence to them of alleged Chinese bad faith; few considered whether any *American* library would welcome volunteer foreign student shelvers to help assess and reorganize valuable materials after ten years of disarray).

Americans also felt unfairly constrained by the rules governing library use. In many institutions, library catalogs and departmental collections were off limits to foreign students—as they are to most Chinese undergraduates—and special limits were placed on access to available materials. Chinese graduate students and faculty can borrow ten books or periodicals; undergraduates are limited to five. American *jinxiusheng* (advanced students, whether undergraduate or graduate at home) generally were tied to the Chinese undergraduate restrictions on book-borrowing. This was not much of a problem for those doing course work, since most classes use a single text, but it proved a serious hinderance for students doing research. *Gaoji jinxiusheng*, post-M.A. research students, operated under the rules governing Chinese graduate students but were then subject to higher fees and sometimes precluded from attending classes since they were presumed to be doing research. (The implications of Chinese classifications for foreign students were never entirely clear to me or to the students involved, but they were frequently raised by American students as a point of contention. For example, the university identity pins given to American *jinxiusheng* apparently were identical to those given Chinese undergraduates, further persuading

the American graduate students that they are defined by the Chinese system as second class citizens.) American universities have tended to ignore the issue of student rank when establishing a program in China, leaving to the students the problem of renegotiating their own status—not always a feasible solution.

From the Chinese perspective, research students should not be sent unless their topic is one which the host university clearly can accommodate in terms of faculty adviser and reference materials. University officials complained bitterly of American students who initially outlined very broad research areas, but after arrival narrowed them down to specific fields on which the university had no expertise. The students' view was that unless the topic was vague to begin with, their proposals would be rejected out of hand; the host university replied that it was better to turn down a student than to have him or her spend a year in frustration. Both sides are probably right.

The real dilemma is that the fields in which Chinese universities can easily accommodate researchers are, in fact, fairly narrow and tend to exclude most social sciences (as opposed to humanities). Few American universities have enough dissertation students in Taiping history or classical Chinese literature to sustain an annual exchange program; they need the flexibility to place students in political science, sociology, economics, modern history and other major graduate fields, occasionally including basic sciences. Since few Chinese universities have as yet published catalogs listing departments open to foreigners and faculty research specialties, Americans have been playing a guessing game in which both sides may ultimately be losers. Increasingly, Chinese universities are making this kind of information available (when asked) and the MOE itself publishes an annual listing (sometimes incomplete) of open departments and universities.* Many American institutions simply fail to seek this detailed information when negotiating the exchange relationship, either believing that it is indiscreet to ask or that the reply will not be useful. For most Chinese universities, however, it is not a problem to identify faculty research specialties. Whether students can be found to match these fields is another question. When an American university already has received visiting Chinese students and scholars in sizable numbers and then finds that the students it proposes to send are all in unacceptable fields, the institution-to-institution relationship will certainly feel the strain.

FIELD RESEARCH

The issue of field research raises a special problem, since it is often out of the hands of the individual Chinese university. Apart from Americans, few foreign students in China expect to conduct field research, and only a handful of the Chinese scholars in the United States are involved in such projects; the vast majority are engaged in on-campus study of technical subjects and basic sciences. Thus Americans requesting

*The 1981 MOE list of specialities in Chinese universities and colleges open to foreign students is given in Appendix K of the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse publication, *China Bound: A Handbook for American Students, Researchers and Teachers.*

field research opportunities are in a somewhat unique position; indeed, they are seeking access frequently denied to China's own social scientists. Beginning in early 1981, it became increasingly clear that Chinese policy was hardening on this privilege; American scholars with field research proposals were being turned down and others already in China were facing strong resistance at the local level. Most researchers were being restricted to a maximum of two to three weeks of field research during the spring 1981 semester, if they were granted any at all. This clearly was inadequate time to complete the kinds of projects most had in mind, although highly motivated and energetic researchers did succeed in collecting very interesting data during these short-term efforts. Recent Chinese official announcements seem to indicate that a three week limit will normally be imposed during the 1981–82 academic year, although it is clear that exceptions can be and are made in special cases.

Chinese resistance to long-term field research seems to be based on several factors: the burden such research requests place on faculty and foreign affairs staff at the host university; public security concerns (sometimes vindicated by irresponsible behavior on the part of American researchers); unfamiliarity with Western field research methods; discomfort with the breadth of data collected (recent data to which they themselves may lack access); and uncertainty about how that data might be used in the West. The existence of a national "state secrets law" which defines as secret anything not *officially* released further complicates the process of collecting information and taking research materials home at the end of the researcher's stay. In a period of political tension and debate, China's policy of limiting field research simplified the control problem, but it also raised tensions in the U.S.-China academic relationship. It is not clear how the issue will be handled in the future, but prospective researchers certainly should not presume that field work will be facilitated as a matter of course.

Despite all these problems, research students did accomplish a great deal, frequently on topics which could not have been pursued elsewhere. The amount they accomplished, in their perception, hinged almost entirely on their ability to cajole, browbeat or circumvent their academic hosts. American faculty members and senior researchers fared considerably better in China, benefiting perhaps from Chinese respect for their positions, from their own broader academic contacts and from their well-focused interests. American students generally felt they failed to receive the same cooperation and benefits accorded senior scholars. The Chinese, however, felt that they had made considerable efforts to accommodate the highly unusual and demanding requests of the American students. Whether a formal exchange relationship can be maintained under the emotional pressure of these opposing views remains to be seen.

The Academic Adviser at the U.S. Embassy in Beijing noted that, despite students' complaints, over half those participating in the National Program extended their stay for a second year. It is not clear whether these extensions demonstrate satisfaction with the first year or recognition that a two year stay is required to conduct one year of research. Certainly no student in a field outside normal Chinese research areas should expect quick and easy access to materials or personnel. Those able to reshape their topic to the available materials or aggressively create their own

research contacts and opportunities accomplished more than those who waited for files to become available or access to be officially granted. As one Chinese university official said, "Americans are quite self-reliant; what we cannot arrange, they just go out and do without us." Perhaps the most successful students were those who worked within the system (attending classes and building rapport with the faculty and administration), built up credit to use when Chinese intervention was useful and also had the ability to work around the system without head-on confrontation. But American institutions may be hard-pressed to find students mature enough to play this delicate diplomatic role. Graduate schools should also consider whether it is reasonable to send their students to conduct field work in a society which is reluctant to accommodate this kind of research.

Daily Living

SOCIALIZING WITH CHINESE

Even harder for most foreign students than the restrictive academic climate was the ambiguous social context in which they and their Chinese peers operated. The most frequent complaint from Americans studying in Beijing was the difficulty of making Chinese friends, a process fraught with hazards unclearly understood or articulated. All Chinese sources, university and government, flatly denied any problem in this regard, insisting that Chinese-American friendships were desirable and natural results of the exchange program. But most Americans interviewed (students and teachers) reported that many Chinese with whom they became close were subjected to questioning, pressure and sometimes explicit punishment for their extensive contact with Americans. There were said to be cases of Chinese roommates who were denied passports on the grounds that their acceptance at an American university was obtained through American roommate influence; rumors circulated about Chinese friends who were expelled from school, fired from jobs or even jailed for excessive fraternizing with foreigners. Chinese students in several universities in Beijing reportedly were read explicit instructions to avoid overly close contact with foreigners; at one institution in another province, university officials reputedly announced in detail the moral failings of each American on campus and how those individuals should be treated.

As noted above, such announcements and meetings were denied by all Chinese officials interviewed.* Ministry of Education representatives offered the following explanation of the apparent contradiction: recent articles in the *People's Daily* had criticized abuses by some Chinese who were illegitimately exploiting their contacts with foreigners (arranging scholarships, getting foreign goods and currency, etc.); these articles may have prompted spontaneous group discussions on a number of campuses and led to varying (and sometimes excessive) decisions about appropriate preventive steps. Certainly wide variation existed in the handling of this problem by each institution, with universities far from Beijing seemingly much more relaxed than those in the capital and nearby. Individual foreign students who had established good reputations were allowed much more leeway than those tagged as troublemakers early on. But few places or people were totally untouched.

Even where no extraordinary steps were being taken, the normal Chinese requirement of registering *(dengji)* any Chinese who visits a foreign dormitory or hotel caused American students considerable discomfort and concern for their Chinese friends. Most Americans believed that if a Chinese friend's name appeared too many times on the registration list, he or she would almost certainly be taken to task in some way.

---

*By December 1981, Chinese government proclamations explicitly spelling out the hazards of cross-cultural fraternization were widely reported in the Western press.

The Chinese say that the registration process is simply to ensure that strangers are not wandering around the foreign dormitory uninvited and that they keep track of who is in and out of the building in order to protect its residents. Whatever the reality, the American perception of hazard was sufficiently strong (and substantiated by enough "incidents" experienced or heard about) to make registration a major bone of contention between Americans and university officials on most campuses.

Americans admit that they have experienced some of the conscious "exploitation" that Chinese officials cite as the reason for discouraging excessive contact: classmates do sometimes ask Americans to bring back tape recorders from Hong Kong, to trade foreign scrip *(waihuijuan)* for domestic *renminbi* or to help get their relatives (or themselves) accepted into American schools. At the very minimum, Chinese students are so eager for English language practice that they may drop by with irritating frequency to pursue this high-priority personal need. Such "abuse" of friendship seems natural and innocent enough to most Americans and is certainly not limited to the American-Chinese relationship. But, set in a context of confusing signals and vague sanctions, it produces a kind of paranoia and cynicism that is crippling for some American students. One young American commented, "Any Chinese who wants to be your friend either wants to use you or is heading for big trouble." Another was convinced she was being followed by security personnel on a regular basis simply because she had Chinese friends. Most believed that their Chinese friends were regularly scrutinized and criticized if their foreign friendships became too obvious. Regardless of the accuracy of these perceptions, the views were widely held and supported by allegedly "documented cases" retold by each group of foreign students; the resulting mood effectively discouraged easy socializing with Chinese students.

HOUSING

The living situation of American students in China reinforced this problem. Unlike most foreign countries where Americans study in any numbers, there is virtually no possibility in China to live with a family or in any setting outside the university. (A few Chinese-American students have made arrangements to live with Chinese families; senior scholars are frequently lodged at hotels for foreign guests.) Despite initial hopes or plans for Chinese roommates, students in very few programs actually had such roommates. Most Americans were housed in separate foreign student dorms, two Americans per room, with their own dining room and a watchman to lock the doors at night and assure the registration of Chinese visitors.

In a few cases, where Chinese roommates had been promised as part of a written institution-to-institution contract, they were eventually provided, but the Chinese clearly hope to omit such commitments from future agreements. From the American perspective, this attitude seems to be further evidence of a desire to isolate the foreign student. For the Chinese university, however, simple economics are involved. Most universities in China have very limited dormitory space suitable for foreigners (modernized, heated, with constant hot water, etc.); every bed in such dorms reserved for a Chinese roommate reduces the number of foreigners who can be accommodated. This limits not only the university's income (U.S. $27–54 per foreigner per

month) but also its ability to expand its institutional links with other American universities. Since Chinese students normally live six to ten per room in far less modernized facilities, their reassignment to the foreign dorm represents a loss of bedspace and income, since few foreigners are willing to be assigned reciprocally to the Chinese student dorm—even if such a solution were approved in principle.

In theory, American students insist they would be happy to live in Chinese dorms if the university would allow it; in fact, only a few cases are known where students petitioned for this right. Where such requests were granted, the university continued to reserve the students' beds in the foreign dorm as well (making a double loss of bed space for the institution). For the most part, Americans simply cannot handle the rugged conditions of the Chinese dorms, with virtually no heat during the cold winters, no fans in summer, no place to study in their rooms, very limited hot water (hot showers perhaps once a week—compounding the olfactory discomfort of an overcrowded small room). Two Americans who did try to live in the Chinese dorm were quite relieved to have their reserved space in the foreign dorm to move back to in winter (or to keep for study and bathing purposes when needed).

Given the high Chinese standard for appropriate treatment of foreigners, the use of Chinese dorm space for foreigners is clearly not a likely solution, aside from the more complicated questions of security and control; Chinese institutions obviously would prefer to restrict the foreign dorms to foreigners. A few have negotiated compromises: each room in the foreign dorm will have two Americans *plus* a Chinese student or one room per floor will be reserved for four to six Chinese students. But the general trend is to move toward (return to?) no mixed living situations. Virtually all Americans with Chinese roommates feel this will remove the one real possibility for cultural and linguistic learning in a Chinese university setting. Given the almost intolerable crowding in all living space, with housing construction now a priority in every region of China, it is not very realistic to anticipate expanded foreign dorm space to accommodate Chinese-American mixed rooms. Most universities have only recently finished construction of their foreign dormitory (or are in process) and have already allocated all the bedspace through their links with American, European and Japanese institutions. Hence, housing is not an area in which the Chinese are prepared to be very flexible.

TRAVEL

Other restrictions that Americans find difficult to accept are controls on personal travel, visits by relatives and friends and university privileges. In order to travel outside their base city, all foreigners must get a travel permit through their host institution indicating the specific cities they plan to visit. American students, accustomed to total mobility and eager to explore China, encounter Chinese university regulations generally limiting student travel to official vacation periods. Even research students not enrolled in classes (not to mention those enrolled but no longer attending) are denied travel permits at other times unless their travel relates directly to approved research needs.

In practice, many universities have interpreted this rule more liberally and have granted frequent weekend travel permits, which the students then stretch into week-

long trips by getting extensions from the public security office of the city they are in on Sunday. Most students traveled extensively during their year in China, both on organized trips and by simply hopping on trains and buses, finding their own hotels (while insisting on student rates) and drifting from city to city. Indeed, many students believed it was during their travels that they had the most meaningful social contacts, mingling with all kinds of people in hard-berth train compartments, talking with strangers on buses and in the street and touring China from Inner Mongolia in the north to Guilin in the south and Urumqi in the west without an official escort to help or hamper their movements. Whether or not such brief encounters really deepened their substantive knowledge of China, they certainly provided an important antidote to the oversupervised and confining context of foreign student life on campus.

The freedom of action which most students take for granted seems incredible to the experienced China hand used to the protective (and restrictive) cocoon of the foreign delegation. It seems unlikely that the system can long tolerate this kind of free-wheeling exploration. Indeed, most students believed (and rumor confirmed) that these travel privileges would be curtailed sharply in the future, limiting them to official field trips during vacations. The rumor may be false, but rumor in China sometimes is a highly accurate guide to policies under serious consideration.

Beyond their own requests for travel permits, many students also requested visas and travel permits for parents, spouses or friends to visit them at some point during their stay. Most were frustrated by the "hassle" the Chinese put them through to obtain such permission, yet Chinese officials were amazed that the requests were even being made. Chinese scholars in the United States expect to spend up to two years here before they are permitted to return home to visit their spouses and children, a benefit which apparently may now be restricted even further. Those within China, working far from their parents' hometown, only recently were granted permission for annual home visits. American students' assumptions that their families should have easy access to Chinese visas, when most foreigners are still allowed to visit China only on delegations arranged far in advance, seem unrealistic, yet they are pervasive. Although Chinese regulations governing resident foreigners specifically state that foreign students are not permitted to have visits from family members during their stay, a large portion of American students did in fact succeed in arranging visits by parents and spouses. As soon as students in one university learned that another institution had assisted its Americans in this regard, they began pressing their own university for similar "rights."

To arrange visas for such visitors, the Chinese host institution must agree to guarantee lodging and oversee the internal travel of the visitor, an obligation it cannot view as simply *pro forma*. Even if the student makes all hotel and travel reservations, the university's foreign affairs office must deal with any emergencies and accept the repercussions, if any. More than just "hassle" is involved, in the Chinese view, and even the hassle factor is probably underestimated by the students making the request. Since most of these family visits are made at the end of the academic year, some universities plan to eliminate the problem simply by restricting the students' own visas to September-June instead of September-August (as at present), requiring them to leave the country before they have time for extended personal or

family travel. This may reduce the problem, but it will hardly satisfy American students and may even heighten the pressure to travel widely in China during the academic year instead of attending classes. American universities negotiating programs are frequently oblivious to such details, but for the students such issues loom large and may play a profound role in their sense of frustration and abandonment by the home campus.

Supervision of Students

ROLE OF THE *LIUBAN*

Virtually all major Chinese universities have a foreign affairs office *(waiban),* which is responsible for, among other things, the well-being and supervision of foreign students on campus. Normally under one of the university vice presidents, this office usually also handles the processing of Chinese students going abroad, the reception of foreign delegations and other exchange relationships with foreign institutions. Where the number of foreign students is large, there is usually a foreign student office *(liuban)* either within the foreign affairs office or separate from it. The *liuban* is frequently housed in the foreign students' dormitory and closely oversees every aspect of student life. Needless to say, it is this office which bears the brunt of foreign student frustration. *Liuban* staff members are caught between student requests, university regulations, public security requirements, national and local policy shifts and the power of outside institutions to decide what access, if any, they will allow foreign students.

Where students take language courses separate from normal university offerings, the *liuban* may also be responsible for a special teaching staff (normally drawn from the university's Chinese department). Sometimes *liuban* staff members include former faculty; frequently one or more members speak English and are assigned responsibility for the Americans. Every element of student life comes under their purview: dormitory management, registration of visitors, field trips, approval of travel permits, foreign dining room, mail, even (in at least one case) library requests. The issues over which conflict can (and does) arise are legion. One visiting American faculty member suggested to the *liuban* that they move their office out of the foreign student dorm as a way of reducing hostilities: "If the students have to walk a few blocks to file their complaints, they may cool off by the time they get there." Unspoken, but perhaps implicit in his suggestion, was the hope that "Big Brother" might seem less oppressive if not installed right down the hall. While American students generally criticized and distrusted their *liuban,* most also recognized that staff members worked hard and were often caught in a bind not of their own making. Many even looked back with affection toward staff members who had been considered "the enemy" the year before.

The *liuban* staff at most universities had equally ambivalent views of the American students. They often remarked that the Americans were fiercely independent, rather insensitive to Chinese reasons for constraints, unwilling to listen and impatient. However, most also seemed genuinely to respect the Americans for speaking their minds, pushing hard on research needs and being willing to admit error when they finally understood the situation. As one *liuban* staffer said, "With the Americans, at least you always know where you stand. They tell you how they are feeling at every moment." The Chinese proverb "without discord there can be no accord" fits the relationship nicely; most students and *liuban* end the year respecting each other's problems, even feeling emotionally tied by the stormy process of struggle and

misunderstanding. Given the much more formal and aloof relationship of student and professor in Chinese society, the *liuban* staff is usually the only university personnel with whom the American students have any extended contact, particularly if one includes the language instructors in the *liuban* category. Students who recognized the real limits on the *liuban* staffs' power and who confined their demands to crucial issues tended to fare better in the relationship and the results it yielded.

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

At Chinese universities where the president or vice president had a personal commitment to the exchange relationship (usually growing out of past experience as a student in the United States), this was evident in the American students' ability to negotiate problems rather than push to a stalemate. While all Chinese universities are subject to the same national guidelines and constraints, there was a marked difference in terms of assistance on specific research needs, willingness to bend dormitory regulations, etc. Ironically (but predictably), universities with a reputation for liberal treatment of American students also produced the most organized foreign student lobbying groups. One group of foreign teachers and students organized a sit-down strike over inadequate heat in the foreign dormitory; at another university, a "foreign student council" negotiated changes in dorm curfews and guest registration rules. Effective foreign student mobilization is complicated, however, by the diversity of nationalities, ages, levels of study and program structures involved. The European, Japanese and Third World students, usually undergraduates sent by their own governments for career-related training, may have less interest in cooperating with the more independent American "organizers." The Chinese assignment of housing and language classes by nationality also tended to reduce cooperation across national lines. Yet privileges granted just to the Americans raised other problems, hinting of "favored nation" treatment for the United States—a sensitive issue for China given its role in the Third World.

At universities less willing to be flexible, the administration was sometimes viewed with hostility and even paranoia. American students at several institutions were convinced that they were being tailed, that their mail was being opened or that staff members were obstructing the most routine requests.

One university arranged for American students to channel all library book requests through the *liuban* ("so that the students will not have to learn our very complicated cataloging and ordering system"). When books were not available, as was frequently the case, students assumed it was because the staff was refusing to process the bookslips. Whether these students actually received fewer books than they would have by going directly to the library is unclear, but the result was that hostility was directed at the administrative rather than library staff. The university in question plans to correct the problem next year by simply reserving a shelf of preselected books and placing them in the foreign student dorm; this solution will probably be interpreted by the students as further evidence that the administration is trying to control their lives and isolate them. At other universities, library staff stamped the word *wai* (foreign) on all American book request slips, making it easy to single these out for special handling. American students assumed the motive was to restrict rather than expedite access to library materials.

FACULTY ADVISERS

Graduate students pursuing research were assigned a faculty adviser with whom they worked in addition to the *liuban*. Experiences vary widely; some advisers were quite helpful, but others apparently were virtually inaccessible. A good deal depended on how closely the student's research topic coincided with the faculty adviser's interests or expertise. The concept of a faculty member assisting the process of research without being expert in the precise topic is not one with which many Chinese educators are comfortable. The professor's role is to impart knowledge, not guide students engaged in independent research. If the research area seemed at all sensitive politically, faculty members tended to be even less comfortable in lending assistance. In any case, few faculty members have the ability to arrange access to materials outside the university itself, and the student often was limited to the university's own archives. Requests for access to other archives are extremely time-consuming; crossing bureaucratic boundaries can require clearances at many levels, not just a quick phone call (as if phone calls ever went through quickly!). Some universities actually assigned additional staff members to assist in processing American student research requests, but such aid often came only at the end of a long and sometimes fruitless year.

HOME CAMPUS SUPERVISION

Very few long-term programs had a resident American faculty member serving as academic adviser, although in principle the Chinese would welcome the presence of an official "responsible person." Lacking this, the host institution sometimes required the students to identify their own group leader, through whom all requests and decisions would theoretically be channeled. American students had a hard time dealing with this procedure at first but usually adjusted, albeit never to the degree the Chinese hoped. Where an American faculty member from the home institution was present, it certainly facilitated negotiations at all levels. It also provided a possibility for assessing students' work, reviewing grading standards and restructuring programs before problems became crises. One such resident director strongly recommended that a faculty member go to China for at least the startup period since "the Chinese really need some official guidance on the program's objectives and the home institution's expectations." A surprising degree of confusion and misinformation can develop when American students and Chinese administrators must develop the program as it goes along, (i.e., arguing over exams, grading, auditing privileges, etc.). It also is unlikely that the Chinese would take the initiative in contacting the home institution to straighten out such problems, which tend to drag on until either the students frantically call home for help or the Chinese rewrite the contract for the following year to preclude negotiation over the issue involved.

Normally, a professor or administrator from the home campus will visit the Chinese university at some point during the year (or at the conclusion of the program) to discuss the next year's arrangement. While useful, this visit often comes too late to iron out the current year's problems. In addition, the Chinese style of receiving such a delegation, intermingling extraordinary hospitality with heavy scheduling of events, is not conducive to hard negotiations and mutual criticism. Those who

have eaten and toasted their way through the customary welcoming banquets in China know how difficult it is to make firm requests of their host the following morning without feeling boorish and ungrateful.

The flip-side of the quick visit problem is the limited interaction such delegations have with their own students, an interaction often dominated by student outpourings of complaints and frustrations. One prominent university delegation received such negative feedback from their students that they publicly threatened to discontinue the entire exchange program, not at all the objective the students were seeking. Given the need for students to "unload" their problems before discussing the program's obvious merits, visiting delegations would do well to schedule several days of discussions before confronting their hosts. The entire exchange history with China is still so new, and there is so little context in which to place student complaints, that quick debriefings and hasty reactions seem ill-advised, at best.

There appears to be equal hazard in the lack of information sharing on the home campus. Few American colleges and universities have fully informed their own faculty members and administrative personnel about the evolving China exchange experience, often resulting in considerable misinformation and even ill-feeling among different parts of the home campus. Similarly, American students in China rarely communicate their complaints to the relevant home campus office (or do so only after the fact) and hence faculty members or administrators at home with useful leverage or expertise often are ignorant of the problems until they reach crisis proportions. As a result, the exchange relationship fails to utilize fully the American institution's resources or to take full advantage of opportunities. On many American campuses, there is a significant risk that China exchange programs may be jeopardized by the information vacuum in which they operate and the lack of a broad-based institutional constituency.

CREDIT AND GRADING

Given the brevity of the exchange relationship, it is not surprising that few American institutions have sorted out the question of how (even whether) credit should be awarded for student work in China. In fact, this issue haunts most study abroad programs where students are enrolled in a foreign university while receiving home campus credit.

Some American institutions award a full year of credit for the year in China, but only on a pass-fail basis, implicitly concluding that American grading standards cannot be accurately applied to the work done in the PRC. Other schools give a limited number of credits for language work (ranging from one-third to three-quarters of what one could accomplish on the home campus during the same time span). Sometimes the American institution accepts grades awarded by the faculty in China; other institutions plan to evaluate language progess and award grades only after home-campus testing of returned students. Some universities simply consider the year in China a leave of absence, for which no tuition is charged and no credit awarded (unless the student applies individually to bring in transfer credits).

This range of standards is similar to that for U.S. institutions operating study programs in Europe, Latin America or elsewhere; what was different with programs in

China was the students' confusion about whether they were going to be graded or get credit, and if so, how. Amazingly, most students did not seem terribly concerned about this, perhaps having already written off the year in their own minds as a "break" from their formal education. Others wanted the credit question clarified, but admitted candidly that the academic level of their work in China was beneath that for which they would normally receive credit at home. All the students felt that they had learned enormous amounts about China during their stay, but few had any thoughts about how that learning might be translated into academic credit. Again, a familiar dilemma for the study abroad administrator.

Few American institutions have considered the possibility of independent study in China, requiring students to synthesize their formal and nonformal learning and submit the result for academic review upon return to the home campus. Although not always obtained in the classroom, many student insights clearly were relevant to their past academic work; student comments ranged from "I've learned that nothing I had read about China before was really accurate" to "I'm beginning to understand what 'bureaucracy' means." Unfortunately, there is little opportunity for students to think through these issues rigorously while in China and usually no incentive for them to pursue these questions in an academic context after their return to the United States. Thus, the insights remain unarticulated or half-explored. One program with a resident American faculty director had built into the schedule a required seminar on contemporary China under his direction. The purpose of the seminar was to allow students to analyze their daily observations and relate them to readings in the course.

The problem confronting American institutions trying to assign credit for general courses is the usual dilemma of not knowing course content in advance. Difficult in any foreign setting, this problem is heightened by China's steady revision of textbooks and general university curricula, not only in the language courses for foreigners (which are undergoing constant experimentation and revision), but in other courses as well. There is just no way of knowing before arrival in China what a course will cover. While Chinese language departments in the United States might be willing to guarantee credit for a year's study in the PRC, few other departments can justify such a decision without more concrete information about course content or quality.

Whether solving the credit issue would stimulate students to devote more energy to their formal studies in China is not clear; certainly few students at present attend more than half their assigned course load. In some cases, Chinese faculty members expressed concern about this; in other institutions, they commented that Americans were more diligent than European or African students who are often assigned to study in China by their governments and lack strong personal interest in doing so. The more diligent Americans were usually graduate students who felt pressured to make significant progress either in their research or in coursework significantly linked to their dissertation topics. For those doing dissertation research, the credit issue is moot, except perhaps as a fulfillment of residency requirements. None of the graduate students seemed too concerned with this issue, although a few had struggled over whether national or university fellowships could be applied to cover their costs in China—a question not unrelated to the accreditation of their work.

Summer Language Programs

Because short-term summer language programs differ so markedly from those during the academic year, this section will review summer programs in the context of topics covered earlier: range of activity, academic goals and realities, daily living, supervision, costs and accreditation. With 300–400 students in such programs each summer, this category represents well over half of all American students in China. Available to those with minimal prior language training and placing little strain on Chinese university resources, summer language programs will almost certainly continue to be the major avenue to China for American students. They include programs co-sponsored by American institutions and schools in China with which they have formal agreements, programs run by private nonprofit organizations, groups of students organized by an American faculty member and study-travel packages put together by private entrepreneurs.

Some American institutions with formal exchange agreements have limited the sending of students to intensive summer language programs, although both faculty exchanges and the receiving of China students at home occurs year round. The main reason for such limitations is the insufficient number of home campus students interested in, or prepared for, academic programs in China. Even during the summer, few American colleges and universities have sufficient numbers of students to support a full program and therefore virtually all accept students from other institutions. Some schools participate in formal consortia programs, such as that run by the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE), providing their students with access to China while reducing each institution's administrative burden.

Individual students may apply to the consortia programs or may participate in programs organized by private institutions or faculty members operating independent of university sponsorship. Information about such opportunities usually is available through campus study abroad offices or through advertisements in China-related journals. Appendix C lists the major programs sponsored by U.S. universities and private organizations and those offered by Chinese universities as of June 1981.

From the Chinese perspective, the summer is the easiest period to accommodate foreigners since their own students leave campus around July 15 and return in early September. Dorm space and faculty are more readily available, and the short-term students raise few of the substantive or resource problems posed by students who stay for a full year. Chinese universities (and the MOE) welcome summer programs arranged by American sponsors. In addition, some Chinese universities have started their own direct recruiting of students. Several have recently published brochures advertising short-term (four to eight week) language programs available during the summer and/or the academic year; a sample brochure describing such programs is reprinted in Appendix D. The brochures appear to be based on a single model, perhaps supplied by the MOE, and vary only slightly in program description, tuition and food costs, etc. Some of the universities offering intensive language programs have no prior experience in teaching Chinese to foreign students and indeed have no other foreign students on campus in any field.

The stimulus for this recruitment effort is probably mixed: the need for foreign currency (useful in sending their own staff or students abroad or purchasing foreign materials and equipment); a way to utilize excess bedspace and teaching capacity during vacation periods; an opportunity to forge additional links with American institutions; and an educational service to American friends wishing to learn Chinese.

Most summer programs include six weeks of language instruction (four hours per day, Monday through Friday mornings) plus two weeks of optional travel to several Chinese cities. Afternoon lectures and weekend activities also are frequently arranged by the host university. The curriculum usually is comprised of four courses: spoken Chinese; listing comprehension; written Chinese; and (sometimes) newspaper reading or calligraphy. Students tend to live two per room in the university's guest house or foreign student dorm, with a separate dining room offering Chinese and some Western-style food. Programs starting in mid-June overlap with the Chinese academic year so that the Americans have some opportunity to socialize with Chinese students; by mid-July most Chinese students have left campus until the following September.

The effectiveness of the summer programs varies depending on the teaching quality, the host university's arrangements, the sponsoring organizations and the goals of student participants. For those eager to spend some time in the People's Republic of China, to get language practice with native speakers or to experience Chinese-style language instruction, the summer is usually perceived as quite successful. Those with other goals, or very high expectations about significant language progress, may be disappointed. An eight week program in China is not likely to cover the equivalent of a year's work at home (as do some intensive summer language programs in the United States), nor will the student in China have the time or opportunity to travel widely or conduct research. A few participants at one summer program expressed dismay that they would leave China without seeing Beijing; their prearranged two week tour included only Nanjing, Hangzhou, Guangzhou and Shanghai. Some students seemed unaware that they could not simply hop on a train and visit sites off their formal itinerary. Intensive class schedules and organized extracurricular activities also effectively limit the amount of free time available for independent sightseeing.

The host institution assumes that summer students come solely for language study, and normally is unwilling to assist with student research projects. The limited time available and the intensity of the summer programming would also argue against the likely effectiveness of students trying to conduct research during their summer stay in China.

Costs for short-term language programs offered by the Chinese range from 600–900 *renminbi* (approximately U.S. $400–600) for five to eight weeks of instruction. Housing costs are uniformly three *renminbi* (approximately U.S. $2) per day; food costs are about four *renminbi* per day. An optional two week sightseeing tour at the end of the program is available for about 1,000 *renminbi* (about U.S. $650). The maximum cost to the student for six weeks' instruction, room and board and two weeks' sightseeing would be approximately 2,000 *renminbi* (U.S. $1,300), not including roundtrip transportation to China (currently about $1,000 minimum from the West Coast).

Almost all the summer language programs sponsored by American academic or nonacademic institutions run at least $1,000 higher for the same period of time. There are various reasons for the additional costs, some of which directly benefit the participating students. Programs sponsored by an accredited U.S. institution can offer credit for the summer language program in a form that is usually more easily accepted by the student's home institution than is the certificate of completion issued by the Chinese university. Some of the consortia programs can make similar credit-granting arrangements through one of the participating U.S. institutions; most of the programs offered by nonacademic organizations or private individuals in the United States lack such credit-granting capacity. Some, but not all, of the American programs include the participation of an American faculty member (usually a professor of Chinese language) who serves as academic supervisor. Where necessary, this faculty member can negotiate with the Chinese hosts for program adjustments or suggest modification of the program for the following year. A formal orientation program often is offered prior to entering China to assist students in adjusting to the very different social, political and academic environment.

Programs with American academic sponsorship usually are somewhat selective in their screening of applicants, ensuring at least minimal compatibility of levels and goals. Other U.S.-based programs, and certainly the Chinese universities, tend to accept virtually all applicants. While this may produce an interesting mix of participants (high school and college students, returned professionals, tourists, adventurers), it does not always produce the ideal academic context in which to conduct intensive language instruction. Finally, an established program based on continuing ties between American and Chinese universities often is able to restructure and improve program elements over time, while Chinese universities just beginning to teach Chinese to foreigners may require some on-the-job learning themselves for the first few years, without the benefit of sustained advisory input from American colleagues in a partner institution.

The summer study option offers a good compromise solution for undergraduates with strong curiosity and a desire for exposure to China but lacking specific academic goals which require a more extended stay. Obviously, two months in China provides a more superficial and limited learning opportunity, but it also considerably reduces the expense, frustration and possible "waste" of an academic year spent wrestling with an academic system possibly unsuited to the student's needs. For graduate students or others with highly focused academic plans and sufficient linguistic ability, the summer program is no substitute for the year long stay, provided the necessary arrangements can be made to ensure that desired work can be accomplished.

Evaluation and Summary

In conversations with Chinese officials and with American students at various levels of study and in different institutions, it became increasingly clear that there is no "right" way or "right" time to study in China. At least for the present, substantial problems exist in every situation. Some of these problems are of a start-up nature; others may be inherent in American-Chinese cultural interaction. Chinese language instruction for foreign students will certainly improve steadily over time; some of the restrictions on research may yield to concerted American public and private pressures. But China's political and educational structure will never be entirely compatible with the American style and approach to education. As one mixed group of American students concluded, "Undergraduates aren't sophisticated enough to handle it; the classes are too elementary for graduate students; and researchers can't really do research." But when asked if they personally wished they had not come, not a single member of the group regretted his or her decision; while China might not be "right" for others in their situation, each of them was personally grateful for the opportunity to be there.

For advanced students whose field requires extended time in China for study or research, the National Program administered by the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China offers perhaps the most secure route, but selection for participation is highly competitive. Sponsored by the federal government, and assisted by an adviser based at the American Embassy in Beijing, students and researchers in this program have access to more immediate and higher level support should problems arise in relationships with their Chinese host institutions. This is not to imply that National Program scholars have a significantly smoother or more productive time than those coming through other channels, but rather that they may not feel so completely alone in their efforts.

Students can also apply individually to the Ministry of Education or directly to a Chinese university, but the likelihood of acceptance is very slight unless they have personal contacts within China willing to support the application. During the summer, as noted above, individual students should have little difficulty being accepted into one of the many programs sponsored by American or Chinese universities or by private U.S. organizations.

For American academic institutions interested in developing access routes to China for their students and faculty, formal exchange agreements may provide the simplest solution—if handled properly on both sides. The current experience of schools in institution-to-institution relationships suggests that success has not been complete, for reasons outlined earlier and summarized below.

Formal exchange agreements rarely spell out in sufficient detail the types of students to be involved, the regulations under which they will operate or the mechanism for resolving problems as they arise. Each year's students must negotiate on their own and their success (if any) does not seem to improve the situation for future students. In addition, some U.S. program administrators have sent students

whose linguistic, academic or emotional preparation was clearly inadequate, burdening the Chinese institution with the problem of making *ad hoc* arrangements for students unable to fit into their normal foreign student framework. Whether this inadequate selection results from the pressure to maintain a reciprocal flow of students or from a lack of clarity about what kind of work is possible at various levels of preparation, the effect is to produce frustration on the part of both the student and the host institution.

The institution-to-institution format seems to work best when there are personal links developed between faculty at both institutions, preferably in the specific departments in which the students will be working. In China, far more than in the United States, personal relationships are the key to surviving the bureaucracy; what seems impossible in theory can usually be accomplished in "special cases." This kind of flexible regulation exists universally, but in China it is a particularly important safety valve in the bureaucratic pressure cooker. The closer the personal relationship and mutual indebtedness of the schools involved, the more likelihood that each side will find its requests met and its students well treated (within realistic institutional limits).

The problem of institutional limits is a very real one for both sides. Chinese institutions simply do not have the facilities or experience to cope effectively with students that have limited language experience—and American institutions produce only a small number of students with enough Chinese language to function effectively in a regular university setting in China. Add to this dilemma the restricted fields in which Chinese universities are prepared to accept students, and the problem starts to appear insoluable. Even at the national level, there is concern that the selection process might be skewed in the direction of acceptable projects rather than the best projects. For an individual institution, the problem is heightened by the presumed reciprocity of the exchange; having already received large numbers of Chinese students and scholars (primarily in the physical sciences), the American school is strained to produce enough candidates in appropriate fields at advanced language levels to keep the relationship even minimally reciprocal.

Even those American universities with over 100 Chinese students and scholars on their campuses (e.g., Columbia, Minnesota, MIT, Stanford, UC-Berkeley and Wisconsin) have sent fewer than ten of their own students to China in any given year (including those selected to participate in the National Program). While this is consistent with the national ratios, one might have expected a higher participation rate from schools with major East Asian studies programs and extensive direct relationships with universities in China. My own university, Stanford, has no formal institution-to-institution links but has developed a series of informal understandings with various Chinese institutions and the MOE. The number of Chinese students and scholars that Stanford receives and Americans it sends to China through these channels are roughly comparable to those of institutions with more formal exchange agreements, but the amount of effort and negotiation required is much greater. The absence of a formal agreement between institutions does not appear to limit significantly the number of American students placed in China, but it certainly can complicate the placement process. Without a well-defined channel and commitment to accept students, the need for personal intervention and a network of contacts

becomes even more essential. The absence of a formal link may reduce to some degree the Chinese institution's expectations regarding their own candidates' placements in the United States, although expectations still tend to exceed the capacity of most academic departments to which they have applied.

Although eager to establish ties with major American schools, Chinese universities perceive institution-to-institution links as carrying limits as well as benefits. In Chinese, the term *jie-mei* (sister) often is used to describe such relationships—a phrase which communicates well the sense of mutual responsibility sometimes implicitly assumed on the Chinese side. First, there is the obligation to accommodate as well as possible the candidates received from the sending school, regardless of the appropriateness of their selection. The right of the host institution to screen out proposed candidates is still a painful issue for many "sister" schools. In addition, the existence of a formal exchange agreement appears to restrict the ability of Chinese institutions to place their own students and scholars in the United States. The vice president of one Chinese university commented that the Ministry of Education had refused to assist in placing the school's candidates in U.S. institutions because it assumed that the school had privileged access to its "sister" institution. Particularly at the graduate and post-graduate level, there are real liabilities to being limited to a single institution, given the wide range of American graduate programs.

Whatever the limitations, it is important that some form of access be maintained, for both sides' sake. Whether or not the Chinese classroom is an effective learning site for American students of contemporary China, it surely provides closer touch with reality than can be achieved at home. For those who have studied there, China and its problems are better understood at both the intellectual and gut levels. One recently returned graduate student sums it up vividly:

> Working in China . . . there are many reasons for paranoia and frustration; there are real obstacles to getting what you want; there are some bad people you must deal with. But it is also true that these are the realities of Chinese life and that, by getting the trivial taste a foreigner gets of these frustrations, one is truly learning what it is like to live in China. By learning how to get around or overcome these difficulties, one can begin to understand what it is like to be Chinese.

This student, and others, would argue that American institutions should do more to reduce their students' frustration and to exercise the kind of leverage to which Chinese universities must respond. Whether they can, and will, is far from clear. More thorough screening, preparation and supervision by American sending institutions would certainly improve the situation. Without the sustained and mutually productive development of institution-to-institution relationships, American student access to China may be restricted to the highly structured language training programs most easily accommodated by the Chinese system and least essential or productive from the American scholarly perspective. For the American academic administrator, the question of how to proceed is a tricky one. Many American and Chinese educators have worked hard to build a productive exchange relationship, but the results have been uneven and, for American student participants, often disappointing. There are certain fundamental differences in the two countries' educational

systems which make some frustration inevitable. There have also been some hasty, perhaps ill-conceived, programs and a failure to discuss or resolve problems along the way. Candor, patience and sustained effort on both sides are needed now more than ever if the new and promising relationship is to thrive.

APPENDIX A

U.S.-CHINESE INSTITUTIONAL AGREEMENTS*

U.S. Institution	Chinese Institution
Appalachian State University	Northeast Institute of Technology, Shenyang
Boston University	Huazhong Institute of Technology
Bryn Mawr College	Shanghai Foreign Languages Institute
California State University at Los Angeles	Harbin Institute of Technology
Central Washington University	Anhui University Nanjing University
City College of New York	Shandong University
College of Staten Island/ City University of New York	Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhaung
Columbia University	Beijing University
Cornell University	Chinese Academy of Sciences Fudan University Shanghai Jiaotong University Southwestern Jiaotong University Xi'an Jiaotong University
Duke University	Nanjing University
East-West Center	Ministry of Agriculture
Georgetown University	East China Normal University
Goshen College	Northeast Engineering College, Shenyang Sichuan Teachers College, Chengdu
Hamline University	Beijing University
Harvard University	Shandong University
Illinois State University	Foreign Languages Publication Bureau
Indiana University	Shandong University Wuhan University

*This list was compiled from information submitted by American institutions to the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse as of September 1981.

U.S. Institution	Chinese Institution
Iowa State University	Shenyang Agricultural College
Lamar University	Jilin University
Lewis and Clark College	Guangxi Provincial College
Louisiana State University	East China Normal University
Massachusetts Medical College	Shanghai First Medical College
Michigan State University	Heilongjiang Academy of Agricultural Science
	Institute of Botany (Chinese Academy of Sciences)
	Jiangsu Academy of Agricultural Science
	Nankai University
	Northeast College of Agriculture
	Sichuan University
	Xibei University
Montana State University	Jilin University
New York University—Law School	Jilin University
Northeastern University	Beijing Polytechnic University
	Hunan University
	Qinghua University
	Shanghai University of Science & Technology
Northwestern University	Fudan University
Oberlin College	Shansi Agricultural University
	Taiyuan Institute of Engineering
Ohio State University	Wuhan University
Pomona College	Nanjing University
Purdue University	Harbin Institute of Technology
Queensborough Community College	Chinese Academy of Sciences
	Ministry of Education
Rockefeller University	Chinese Academy of Sciences
Rutgers State University	Jilin University
San Francisco Conservatory of Music	Shanghai Conservatory of Music
Seton Hall University	Beijing Institute of Foreign Trade
	Beijing Languages Institute
	Wuhan University
Siena Heights College	Jilin University, Changchun
Springfield University	Beijing Institute of Physical Culture

U.S. Institution	Chinese Institution
State University of New York—Albany	Beijing University Fudan University Nanjing University
State University of New York—Buffalo	Beijing Bureau of Higher Education Beijing Foreign Languages Institute Beijing Institute of Economics Beijing Normal College Beijing Polytechnic University Chinese Academy of Sciences
State University of New York—Cortland	Beijing Normal College
State University of New York—New Paltz	Beijing University
State University of New York—Stony Brook	Beijing University Fudan University Shanghai Jiaotong University
Temple University	Nankai University Tianjin Normal College
Tufts University	Beijing Foreign Languages Institute
University of California—Berkeley	Beijing University
University of California—Los Angeles	Chinese Academy of Sciences Chinese Academy of Social Sciences Import-Export Commission Zhongshan University
University of California—Santa Barbara	Chinese Academy of Sciences
University of California—Santa Cruz	Beijing Languages Institute
University of Connecticut—Storrs	Beijing Normal University
University of Hawaii—Manoa	Beijing Foreign Languages Institute
University of Illinois—Champaign-Urbana	Fudan University
University of Iowa	East China Institute of Hydraulic Engineering, Nanjing
University of Kansas	Nanjing University Nankai University

U.S. Institution	Chinese Institution
University of Maryland	Anhui University
	Beijing University
	Chinese University of Science & Technology
University of Massachusetts—Amherst	Beijing Normal University
University of Michigan	Shanghai Jiaotong University
University of Minnesota—Twin Cities	Academy of Agricultural Sciences
	Beijing Agricultural University
	Beijing University
	Central South Institute of Mining and Metallurgy
	Fudan University
	Jilin University
	Jilin University of Technology
	Nankai University
	Qinghua University
	Xi'an Jiaotong University
University of Missouri—Kansas City	Shanghai Second Medical College
University of Nebraska—Lincoln	Beijing University
	East China Normal University
	Nanjing University
	South China Teachers College
University of Pennsylvania	Shanghai Jiaotong University
University of Pittsburgh	Beijing Foreign Languages Institute
	Beijing Normal University
	Institute of Space Technology
	Shanghai Jiaotong University
	Shandong University
	Tianjin University
	Xi'an Jiaotong University
University of San Francisco	East China Normal University
University of Utah	Hangzhou University
	Zhejiang Agricultural University
	Zhejiang Medical University
	Zhejiang University
University of Washington	Shandong University
University of Wisconsin—Madison	Nanjing University
Vassar College	Beijing Languages Institute

U.S. Institution	Chinese Institution
Washington University	Shanghai Jiaotong University
Wayne State University	Chinese University of Science & Technology
	Shanghai Jiaotong University
	Zhejiang University
Western Michigan University	Nanjing University
World College West	Beijing Languages Institute
Yale University	Wuhan University

APPENDIX B

CHINESE INSTITUTIONS WITH AMERICAN STUDENTS ON CAMPUS FOR SIX MONTHS OR LONGER IN 1980–81*

Beijing University	Formal Agreements: State University of New York, Albany - 3; University of California, Berkeley - 2; Michigan State University - 2; State University of New York, New Paltz - 3; Columbia University - 1 Informal Agreements: Pomona College - 1 National Program: 7 MOE Placements: 8
Beijing Languages Institute	Formal Agreements: Seton Hall University - 7; University of California, Santa Cruz - 4; World College West - 2 Informal Agreements: Vassar College - 2 MOE Placements: 15
Beijing Normal University	Formal Agreements: University of Massachusetts, Amherst - 15
Fudan University	Formal Agreements: University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana - 1; Northwestern University - 3; State University of New York, Stony Brook - 3 Informal Agreements: Wellesley College - 3 National Program: 2 MOE Placements: 5
Nanjing University	Formal Agreements: Duke University - 1; Pomona College - 8; State University of New York, Albany - 1; University of Wisconsin, Madison - 6 National Program: 8 MOE Placements: 2

*This listing does not include many other links between U.S. and Chinese institutions involving exchange of faculty rather than students or arrangements through which students go for short-term study. Information listed was given to the author during interviews with Chinese university officials and may not agree with information received from U.S. institutions.

Nankai University	Formal Agreements: Temple University - 1; Michigan State University - 2 National Program: 2 MOE Placement: 1
Wuhan University	National Program: 2
Zhongshan University	Formal Agreements: University of California, Los Angeles - 5 MOE Placements: 2

APPENDIX C

SUMMER LANGUAGE PROGRAMS IN CHINA FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS*

Private Organization Sponsors	Chinese Host Institution
Council on International Educational Exchange 205 East 42nd Street New York, NY 10017	Beijing University (requires two-three years Chinese) Fudan University, Shanghai (requires one year Chinese)
International Cultural Exchange Foundation 313 California Street, Suite 700 San Francisco, CA 94104	Guangxi Normal College, Guilin
U.S.-China Communications: Chinese Language Program 4608 Dorset Avenue Chevy Chase, MD 20015	Shandong University, Jinan
U.S.-China Education Foundation P.O. Box 5801 Duke Station Durham, NC 27706	Central Institute of National Minorities, Beijing Nanjing University Wuhan University Xiamen University
U.S. University Sponsors	
Central Washington University Office of International Programs Ellensburg, WA 98926	Anhui University, Hefei Nanjing University
Columbia University c/o Ms. C. P. Sobelman 501 Kent Hall New York, NY 10027	Beijing Languages Institute East China Normal University, Shanghai

*Based on *Notes from the National Committee*, Vol. 11, Nos. 1-2, Spring-Summer 1981, and conversations with sponsoring institutions and Chinese host universities. Listing these programs does not constitute endorsement by the author or the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse.

U.S. University Sponsors (cont.)	Chinese Host Institution
University of California, Berkeley International Education Office 2538 Channing Berkeley, CA 94720	Beijing Normal University (requires three years Chinese)
University of Minnesota c/o Office of International Programs 201 Nolte West 315 Pillsbury Drive, S.E. Minneapolis, MN 55455	Nankai University, Tianjin (requires one year Chinese)
University of Pittsburgh c/o Prof. Hsieh Chiao-min Department of Geography Pittsburgh, PA 15260	Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhuang
University of San Francisco c/o Dr. Leo Yam International Studies Program: China San Francisco, CA 94117	East China Normal University, Shanghai

Chinese Universities that Recruit Students Directly

Beijing Normal University
East China Normal University, Shanghai
Nanjing University
Wuhan University
Xiamen University
Zhongshan University, Guangzhou

Students interested in applying directly to Chinese universities should write to the Foreign Affairs Office of the appropriate institution.

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE BROCHURE DESCRIBING SHORT-TERM LANGUAGE PROGRAMS OFFERED BY A CHINESE UNIVERSITY

Qualification for Application

Students and teachers of the Chinese language in colleges/universities and secondary schools outside of China and other individuals interested in learning Chinese are welcome to apply. Applicants should generally be between 16 and 45 years of age and physically fit (a health certificate is required).

Dates for Each Term

Spring Term	March-May
Summer Term	June-August
Fall Term	September-November
Winter Term	December-February

Each term generally extends from 4 to 8 weeks.

The exact dates for each term can be arranged on request by groups of no less than 20 members. Advance notification is necessary to allow for preparation.

Academic Program

1. *Placement.* Participants will, upon arrival, be tested for linguistic competence in Chinese and placed in an appropriate class of 10–15 participants with 2 instructors.

2. *Courses.* The courses offered will be Contemporary Chinese, Aural Comprehension, Oral Chinese, Newspaper Reading, etc. They will be taught "putonghua" (known in the West as Mandarin Chinese) and both the Romanization of Chinese words and Chinese character writing. Participants will attend classes 5 days a week, for approximately 20 hours of classroom instruction.

3. *Special Lectures.* Lectures will be given every Wednesday in English on China's geography, history, education, and culture.

4. *Graduation Exercises.* At the end of the Training Course, participants may take examinations and receive certificates if qualified.

5. *Other Activities.* The University will organize meetings with interesting persons, weekend excursions to nearby cities of scenic or historical interest, and viewings of movies and performances. The campus also has facilities for soccer, basketball, swimming, etc.

Room and Board and Transportation

1. Participants will live on campus in the Foreign Students Dormitory, with two persons to a room. No rooms will be available for couples.

2. Meals will be served in the Foreign Students Cafeteria.

3. Transportation will be provided by the University for off-campus academic activities and short trips within Shanghai organized by the University.

Term-end Tour

Upon completion of the Training Course, a group tour of no more than 2 weeks will be organized by the University. One of the following tour routes will be decided on through consultation with the participants.

1. Southern Route: Shanghai-Guilin-Kunming-Chengdu-Chongching (via the Yangze Gorge)-Shanghai.

2. Northern Route: Shanghai-Nanjing-Yangzhou-Zhenjiang-Loyang-Xi'an-Beijing-Shanghai.

3. A short route to be arranged at the time.

Costs

1. *Tuition:*
   (1) 5-week program: RMB 600 (including cost of excursions to Suzhou and Wuxi in addition to trips within Shanghai).
   (2) 6-week program: RMB 700 (including cost of excursions to Suzhou and Hangzhou in addition to trips within Shanghai).
   (3) 8-week program: RMB 900 (including cost of excursions to Suzhou, Wuxi, and Hangzhou in addition to trips within Shanghai and boating on the Huangpu River).
2. *Room and Board:*
   (1) RMB 3 per person per day in a room shared by two, or RMB 2 per person in a room shared by three.
   (2) RMB 4 per person for 3 meals a day at the Foreign Students Dining Hall. Meals off campus will be paid by the participant according to the rates of the place they dine.
   (3) Approximately RMB 1000 for one of the two long tours and RMB 100–200 for a short tour.
   (4) Medical expenses will be borne by the individual.

Arrival and Departure

1. Participants are expected to arrive at the University 2 days before the term begins. Participants will be met at the airport or railroad station, providing they give advance notice of their time of arrival.

2. Participants are required, upon arrival at the University, to present their Notification of Admission and passports, and to pay the sum necessary to cover the cost of tuition, room and board, and term-end tour.

3. Participants are expected to leave China for home upon completion of the Training Course. The University will help make arrangements, at the participant's expense, for air or rail transfers within China if necessary. The University will not be able to provide accommodations for those who do not leave immediately at the close of the term for some special reason.

Some Points for Attention

1. Participants are expected to observe the Regulations and respect the practices and values of the host country while they are enrolled in the program.
2. Participants who arrive late or leave before the completion of the Training Course are not entitled to an extension of courses or refunding.

APPENDIX E

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON U.S.-CHINA EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES

Clough, Ralph N. *A Review of the U.S.-China Exchange Program.* Washington, DC: Office of Research, U.S. International Communication Agency, February 1981.

Fingar, Thomas and Linda A. Reed. *An Introduction to Education in the People's Republic of China and U.S.-China Educational Exchanges.* Revised Edition. Washington, DC: U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse, January 1982.

Fonoroff, Paul. "One Foreign Student's Report from Beijing." *Christian Science Monitor,* January 29, 1981.

Gottschang, Karen Turner. *China Bound: A Handbook for American Students, Researchers and Teachers.* Washington, DC: U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse, May 1981.

Murray, Douglas P. "Exchanging Students and Scholars: Progress and Prospects." *China Exchange News,* Vol. 8, Nos. 5-6, October-December 1980.

Reinhold, Robert. "Peking Hampering Scholars from the U.S." *New York Times,* August 16, 1981.

Viola, Joy and Solveig Turner. "The China Connection: A Conference on Academic Linkages with Higher Education Institutions in the PRC." Boston, MA: Center for Higher Education Documentation, Northeastern University, May 9, 1980.

Walter, Carl. "Studying Economics at Beijing University: A Firsthand Report." *China Exchange Newsletter,* Vol. 7, No. 5, October 1979.

Weisskopf, Michael. "China Restricts Sensitive Study by Foreign Scholars." *Washington Post,* July 31, 1981.

The following newsletters contain frequent articles about academic exchanges with China:

China Exchange News (formerly *China Exchange Newsletter).* Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20418.

NAFSA Newsletter. National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009.

Notes from the National Committee. National Committee on U.S.-China Relations, 777 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017.

Other U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse Publications

An Introduction to Education in the People's Republic of China and U.S.-China Educational Exchanges, January 1980. (out of print)

Survey Summary: Students and Scholars from the People's Republic of China Currently in the United States, April 1980. (free of charge)

Sources of Financial Aid Available to Students and Scholars from the People's Republic of China, August 1980. (free of charge)

China Bound: A Handbook for American Students, Researchers and Teachers by Karen Turner Gottschang, May 1981.

Assisting Students and Scholars from the People's Republic of China: A Handbook for Community Groups by Katherine C. Donovan, July 1981.

Survey Summary: Students and Scholars from the People's Republic of China in the United States, August 1981 by Thomas Fingar and Linda A. Reed, September 1981.

Higher Education and Research in the People's Republic of China: Institutional Profiles by Thomas Fingar, December 1981.

The following materials will be published by the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse in the winter of 1981-82: a revised edition of *An Introduction to Education in the People's Republic of China and U.S.-China Educational Exchanges* and *Bound for the United States: A Handbook for Chinese Students and Scholars.*

These publications are available from the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse, 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009; checks to cover postage and handling charges should be made payable to NAFSA for the appropriate amount: single copy - $1; 5 copies - $2; 10 copies - $3.50; each additional copy - $.25.